

**Herbert C. Hoover and the League of Nations**

---

**SPEECH**

OF

**SENATOR JAMES A. REED**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE

**SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES**

JANUARY 24, 1920



WASHINGTON  
1920

161945—20380



SPEECH  
OF  
SENATOR JAMES A. REED,  
OF MISSOURI.

---

AMERICANIZATION OF ALIENS.

The Senate in Committee of the Whole had under consideration the bill (S. 3315) to promote Americanization by providing for cooperation with the several States in the education of non-English-speaking persons and the assimilation of foreign-born residents, and for other purposes.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. REED. I am tired seeing the Federal Government employ the money of the taxpayers of the country to teach socialism and communism. There has been an enormous amount of money so wasted.

What has become of the old Democratic-Republican doctrine that the individual man must take care of himself except in cases of misfortune or infancy?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was wondering if the Senator thought that we would return to our Democratic moorings by nominating Mr. Hoover.

Mr. REED. That depends. If we adopt the League of Nations, he is the logical candidate for all parties indorsing that un-American scheme to nominate. I will tell you why. The League of Nations surrenders the sovereignty of the world to an organization which will be dominated by the British Empire. That has been proven on this floor time and time again. The British Empire will cast 6 votes in the assembly direct; she will cast the vote of Persia, which decadent land she now owns; the vote of India, her conquered slave; the vote of Portugal, for years a British pawn; the vote of Hejaz, whose King is in her pay.

She will dominate Greece as she has in the past. Belgium, dependent upon her for support, may not resist her imperious will; France, proud and great, confesses her dependence upon the Empire's navy and army. Behold her as she stands, her hands outstretched to the Senate, asking that we jointly with Great Britain guarantee her against Germany. When she appeals to us all must realize that her chief reliance is Great Britain, whose mighty navy and army is at her door.

If, therefore, we have a British league of nations, dominated by British votes, why not nominate Mr. Hoover, who all of the years of his adult life has been a denizen and resident of Great Britain; who never yet cast a vote in the United States, unless he has done so since he came here in the capacity of nonofficial food dictator? Possibly, for the purpose of qualifying for office, he has since voted. Why not have him for our President? He will fit admirably into the new order of things. Permit me to further display my candidate's special pro-British

qualifications. When Mr. Hoover but crossed over to this country he was written up by a eulogist, who undoubtedly spoke by the card and who probably also spoke for the coin. That eulogist, after he had described Mr. Hoover's beautiful house in London and had told us what great corporations he was connected with, stated that, being asked as to his politics, Mr. Hoover declared that he guessed "he was a Liberal." Of course, the Liberal Party is a British party.

Mr. Hoover evidently had not been frequently enough in the United States so that he knew our political parties. Naturally he had to describe his politics by the name of a British political party. The circumstance is a very happy one, for it now eminently qualifies him to run on any platform of any party or on the platforms of all parties, for he owes allegiance to none.

Mr. LODGE. Where did that eulogy of Mr. Hoover appear?

Mr. REED. I put the eulogy into the RECORD when we were first discussing Mr. Hoover. It can easily be found. It was an article written, I think, by Mr. Irwin. It is all copied here and sacredly preserved, covered with the dust of time and laid away in that cemetery of forgotten things, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I call attention in particular to the fact that Mr. Hoover left here when he was 21 or 22 or 23 years of age. When he came back to the United States he was 46 or 47 years old. He had lived in Great Britain or in the British possessions all of that time. In his youth he was taken from America in the employ of a British syndicate which was operating in Australia. At the time he came to this country he was a member of a very large number of syndicates, joint-stock companies, and so forth, that were operating or pretending to operate in many countries of the world, but chiefly in England. There were Romanoffs who were members of some of his Russian corporations, and there were Englishmen galore of various titles and descriptions in others of his syndicates and corporations. Being asked as to his business, his answer was that he was a promoter. I think that is true. Just now he is promoting a boom for President—his own boom.

So, Mr. President, if we are going to have a British League of Nations, by all means let us have a man who has been trained to English life and English politics and English social rules and English business conditions and who has plenty of investments in British companies, so that when he acts in conjunction with Great Britain we will know at least that British money and British capital are being well cared for. If the world is bankrupt and out of the wreckage we are to save nothing but a British League of Nations, by all means let us keep that country solvent. Why not Mr. Hoover? Think of the influence that America, after going into this League of Nations, might be able to exert if it had Mr. Hoover for President. He knows all the English nobility; he has had a lot of them in his companies; there are many of them in his companies yet; therefore he would have the entrée at once, through these financial connections, with the high fiscal authorities of the British Government. He might get many favors for us as we exist as a subordinate State in the League of Nations. If we are going to have a British League of Nations, let us have somebody represent us who can get next to the British Government.

Mr. President, I charge that Mr. Hoover was one of the go-betweens between Mr. House and members high in the British

Government during the negotiations that preceded this war. He was so close to the British Government then as to constitute a convenient connecting link. If anybody wants to investigate that statement, let him offer a resolution of investigation.

In further commendation of Mr. Hoover I direct attention to the fact that he absolutely has no American politics. By reason of that circumstance he will be able to do whatever Great Britain desires him to do without running inconveniently into some political pledge of either the Republican or the Democratic Party, for were he an adherent of either he might be suddenly confronted by a platform announcing some real American principle; some of the old doctrines of the fathers. How inconvenient when we are in the league for an American President, nominated and elected on an American platform, to do business in an organization based upon internationalism, which implies that all nationalities are to be dissolved, all flags be merged into one conglomerate banner, all peoples are thrust into a common melting pot, and that in the fires of the new internationalism all the patriotism of the world is to be consumed. The love of country is to become a thing dead and forgotten. It is to be cast away as a barbarism to be abominated. In the "new era" we are to crush affection for native land and love of the old flag because all that is selfish and wicked and small; we are to become citizens of the world, lovers of mankind, brothers of everybody.

The distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], who is looking at me, may peradventure be our delegate to the new world government. I can behold him entering the great hall at Geneva; the representative of Haiti upon one arm and the representative of Liberia upon the other, thus exemplifying that glorious trinity—brotherhood, charity, and universal love. I could enlarge the picture, but it pains me so, I desist and "return to my muttons." Why not have a man well trained in British affairs to represent us when we take our place in tribunal exactly on a par with a British colony, except in one small particular, namely, we are a permanent member of the council, whereas the colony must be elected from time to time, a thing easily accomplished by the votes controlled by the British Empire. When that has been done the British colony or dependency will be qualified to sit on the council with us, qualified to sit there, although the mother country is a permanent member; qualified to sit there, although there may be three other British colonies there as temporary members. They are qualified to sit on the council because Lloyd-George, Clemenceau, and Woodrow Wilson have certified the fact.

As the procession forms to enter the world capital I observe that at its head marches the representative of the Imperial Government. Immediately back of him come the representatives of four British colonies and the representative of one British slave, India. The slave India wears golden chains, but they are none the less the chains of servitude. Then immediately behind them, in a sort of post of honor, comes the Senator from North Carolina, now the representative of the United States Government, and flanked on either hand, tricked out in the barbaric grandeur of the tropics, the gentleman from Liberia and the gentleman from Hayti, waving fans to keep off the flies. [Laughter.] Coming along immediately behind them is the



gentleman from Siam, the representative of a dying race that is to-day a mere pawn for the British Empire. He is being led by a British officer to tell him where to go and how to go. Then comes an individual wearing a turban, with bare legs, bare arms, and a huge spear over his shoulder. He is drawing \$150,000 from the British Empire as the King of Hedjaz. He is right alongside of the Senator. He has just the same vote as the Senator. And poor Persia, with her newly forged chains, a British possession to-day—the representative of that country follows along, another British vote. And Portugal and Greece—I shall not name them all.

They number a full round dozen, enough votes so that in any controversy the British Empire may have before the assembly of the League of Nations—and every controversy between nations can be sent there—the Empire can prevent a binding decision being rendered against her. This is so because a decision by the assembly must be rendered by the unanimous vote of the members of the council, who are also members of the assembly, and by a majority of the noncouncil members. As the organization is now constituted, there will be 23 votes in the assembly outside of the nine council members. Great Britain already controls a majority of these noncouncil members, so that no such thing as a decision against Great Britain is ever possible. Such are the conditions existing as we are asked to place our neck under the infamous and treacherous yoke. Great Britain has a decision against her effectively blocked. If we are to enter this British League of Nations, will it not advantage us to have a near-British subject as our representative, so why not all be for Mr. Hoover?

It is said that he made \$10,000,000—I saw the statement in a paper; I do not know whether it is true or not—before he was 30 years old.

That, now, is advanced as a reason why he should be elected President of the United States! A get-rich-quick promoter is the kind of man we ought to have for President! The qualification is that he made money and made it quick. We are not to inquire how; that is immaterial, even insolent. But the modern altruist must know that he made it quick.

If that is the supreme qualification and we Democrats nominate Mr. Hoover, then I say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that the only thing that can save his party from defeat is to nominate J. Rufus Wallingford. [Laughter.] Then we would have a race of two horses bred alike, trained alike—neither of them ought to be handicapped a pound, for each would have a fair and equal chance at the money; and as that would be what each of them apparently has most desired and gained in life, by all means let us sit back in the grandstand and watch the performance, for I am sure they would both run true to form.

I trust that the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who asked the question that has unexpectedly led me into this digression, is prepared to indorse Mr. Hoover this morning, and do it publicly. Why, I understand that he has bought two newspapers already, while he is being ravished into this fight.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator means that Mr. Hoover has bought them, not the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And I wish to say that my question did not imply any committal of myself in any sense.

Mr. REED. I am disappointed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I hate to disappoint the Senator, but still I must continue to say that my question was intended to obtain information. I wanted to know something from the Senator from Missouri, and I have learned part of what I had expected to hear. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. If the Senator will compose himself, I will contribute some more. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I will compose myself if the Senator does not suggest again that I meant to endorse Mr. Hoover as my choice.

Mr. REED. I am really a little disappointed, because I thought I had found some one man who was for Hoover besides himself and his press agent. I confess that the sentence I employed was susceptible of a misconstruction.

I did not mean to say that the Senator from Georgia had bought two newspapers. It is the "gentleman from London" who has acquired the two newspapers. He has bought them to keep the people from nominating him, evidently, because by his own vociferous assertions up to this hour, like a coy, blushing, and virtuous maiden he is fighting valiantly to preserve his honor alike against the seductive wiles and brutal force of politicians who ruthlessly seek to overcome his virgin innocence. Nevertheless the newspapers have been acquired, according to the public press. What part of the \$10,000,000 has been thus employed, deponent saith not and knows not. To what purpose they have been purchased I venture no suggestion, except that they must be intended to be so employed as to keep the people from nominating Mr. Hoover.

Mr. President, some day, when I have the time, I am going to have some remarks to make about Mr. Hoover. [Laughter.]

I pass the subject at this time with the remark: To what estate has our country come when it can be seriously proposed that a man shall be nominated for President who probably has never voted yet in the United States; whose every interest and inclination kept him in Great Britain for 23 years out of a life of 46 years; who when he returned to America knew so little about our politics that he described himself as a "Liberal," and who to-day is so ignorant of public policies that even now he can not tell whether he is a Democrat, a Republican, a Socialist, or a Populist; he apparently only knows that he wants to be President of the United States, and we are told he has \$10,000,000. Whether he intends to invest that in his new scheme of promotion remains to be seen. I do not say he has said he will invest it, but the argument that is being put forward—and it looks to me like propaganda, duly inspired—is that he has made \$10,000,000 and that he made it quick. Hence the inference. Why not?

To what estate has a country fallen—men out promoting their own candidacies, running for President, with no other qualification than the fact that they have made money.

About the last qualification in the world for President of the United States is that he has made a lot of money. I commend this philosophy of the Bible—"where a man's treasure is, there will his heart be also." I wonder how many British invest-

ments this recent acquisition to American population, Mr. Hoover, has.

I hope that the rule laid down about getting into heaven will be forever applied to the Presidency. That "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God" ought to be the rule as to the Presidency. I have no attack to make upon men who have made money honestly, and have not made it too quickly, but no man ever ought to be President of the United States who has so much money that he made quickly, or which he made by long drudgery, that the weight of the money may pull him away from the interests of the common people of the land.

I know Mr. Hoover will be very popular with the farmers, to whose wheat, contrary to the spirit of the law, by a gross abuse of the letter of the law, he denied a free market. This Mr. Hoover did. Congress passed a law authorizing the licensing of certain dealers and traders. It did it for no other purpose in the world than to stop the cornering of the market, the forestalling of the market. The debates will show the fact. So, in order to put a ready curb upon these practices Congress provided a system of licensing. I repeat, it was to prevent the evil practices I have described. The law did not give to Mr. Hoover or any other man born of woman the right to fix the price of the grain raised by the farmers of this country.

On the contrary, in order to encourage the raising of grain, the planting of enormous crops, a guarantee by law of a minimum price, which would be made good by the Government, was put into the statute. Instead of giving anybody authority to keep down the price and control the price of the farmer's product, we undertook to encourage the farmer by guaranteeing him against a possible loss, by paying him generously when the world needed his grain.

In this Government of law, where no man has ever been authorized to employ a statute for the purpose of coercing and compelling others to do something he has not given direct authority to command, Mr. Hoover proceeded as I shall state. I charge in advance that he was guilty of an abuse of power which has no parallel in the history of this country. He started upon a deliberate plan to fix the price of the farmer's wheat. The farmer had, speaking broadly, three possible markets. First, the great market afforded by the grain exchanges of the country. As long as that market was open, the farmer could sell there in competition with all the other farmers of the country; he could at the same time have the benefit of the world bidding for his grain.

Mr. Hoover compelled all grain dealers to take out licenses. He did not say to them, as the law contemplated, "You must not profiteer; you must not corner the market. You must let these grains go on to their ultimate destination as rapidly and uninterruptedly as possible," thus carrying out the principle for which the law was enacted. That is not what Mr. Hoover did at all. Mr. Hoover got some of the biggest grain gamblers there ever were in the United States on his board, and then Mr. Hoover said to the grain men, "If you pay a penny more for wheat than I have fixed, I will forfeit your license and destroy your business and ruin you." I do not mean to say that he told them in so many words he would ruin them; he simply said,



"We will forfeit your license," and that spelled ruin. Thus, the farmer, if he sold to the grain dealer, was compelled to take the price that Mr. Hoover fixed, not the price that was fixed in the world market.

One other source of market was the miller. Mr. Hoover licensed the miller, and then said to the miller, "You shall not buy your grain except from the licensed grain dealer, and you must pay him a specified price, which I fix, and if you violate my instructions in the slightest particular, your license will be revoked, your mill will be closed." Finally that order was modified to this slight extent, that wheat hauled in wagons to a mill might be bought by the miller, but that probably is not one thousandth part of the wheat of the United States.

So there was, then, only one other place where the American farmer could sell his wheat, that was abroad. But that way was blocked by the organization of the "wheat corporation," which alone had authority to ship abroad.

It was dominated by Mr. Hoover, and the price again was fixed. So the power to license, which was intended by the law-makers only for the purpose of protecting the country against the men who organized the combinations in restraint of trade, and who sought to hoard provisions and extort prices by hunger, was wrongfully and infamously employed by Mr. Hoover for the purpose of fixing the price of all the grain that was raised on all the farms of the United States. Talk about electing a man of that kind for President! What would a man of that kind do with the great powers of the presidential office, a man who thinks that the right to license a man to sell grain gives him the right to close the market to the American farmer? A man who would give that sort of a construction to the laws of this country, if he were the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, would feel perfectly justified in using all its coercive force to accomplish any end he might have in view.

Mr. President, I want to talk for a minute about the pending bill. I am opposed to placing any fund in the hands of any department of the Government for the purpose of propaganda work. In the first place, the business of looking after the education of the people belongs to the several States. In the second place, I am unqualifiedly opposed to having a board set up here at Washington that proposes to teach the people of the United States what they ought to think. I do not care how well it may run at first, the time is absolutely bound to come when somebody will be in control of that educational bureau who will be educating people according to his notions, and his notions will probably fit in with the political notions of the party that put him in power.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. KENYON. Does not the Senator from Missouri think it might be a good idea to spend some of this money on these Americanization bulletins, and have them sent to the conference?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that will all depend upon who is selected to write the bulletins. If you gave the task to one class, they would anxiously promulgate the doctrine that we ought to be glad to be recognized as the equal of a British colony, and

therefore that true Americanism would consist in the surrender of the sovereignty of this Nation.

There might be, then, the other class, the mild reservationists, who would insist that we yield only part of our sovereignty, that we wade in about to our knees and then stand there trembling, wondering whether we were going to be overwhelmed by the next wave, or whether we will be able to make shore. There might also be another class of old-fashioned, wicked people, who still believe that the American flag is the greatest flag in all the world, who would not exchange the star of a single State for an entire international constellation, who would not surrender the right of a single American citizen for the benefit of the subjects of any foreign power. We might happily have that old-fashioned doctrine taught. In that case I would be satisfied.

The point that I am making, abandoning all satire, is this: Whoever writes this bulletin on Americanism will teach his kind of Americanism in these days when we have so many different kinds of Americans. I am not willing that the Government's money should be spent in that way. When I consider that Mr. Hoover landed here a few months ago and solemnly asserted before the Agricultural Committee that the only residence he had on earth was the Willard Hotel, and that he had arrived there that morning, when we find him regarded as a presidential possibility, I am not willing to trust to the Americanism of all the publicists who may seek to teach Americanism. Let me suggest while we are on the subject that we complete the ticket. Why not Hoover and Creel? [Laughter.]

It is the truth, the very truth, that when they were here in Washington together the old quotation, "How good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity," applied. If you had a ticket composed of Hoover and Creel, you would have two masters of publicity, but in this case the copartnership would not be obliged to go outside and hire talent and import it and bring it here from England, as Mr. Hoover did when he organized this publicity bureau down here at the Capital. In the next place Mr. Creel's lack of knowledge of English politics could be supplied by Mr. Hoover, and the lack of American geography which Mr. Hoover is burdened with could be supplied by Mr. Creel, who is a much-traveled man. In the third place they are both very progressive and forward-looking gentlemen.

The opinions of Mr. Creel have been embalmed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it will be discovered upon reading them that he is almost abreast of the times and nearly up to the advanced kind of politics we are now being taught. I do not know whether he has yet advocated the licensing of all interstate business in order that it can be controlled, but I am sure he would readily accept that doctrine. If he did, and we had Mr. Hoover for President, and had a general law for the licensing of every man engaged in interstate business, so that every man, from the corner grocer to the great manufacturer, would be under a Government license; and if that power were by Mr. Hoover administered, as he has already exercised the license power, truly Mr. Hoover could run this country in every part of its business and in all of its life.

At the same time Mr. Creel, as the boss of publicity, could teach the American people what they were to think and the pro-

gressive ideas they might entertain. Of course, the whole ought to be supplemented by such a law as has been proposed by Mr. Palmer, whereby every citizen of the United States who dares think out loud might be incontinently dragged to jail, haled before a Federal court sitting perhaps some hundreds of miles away from his home, bankrupted in his purse, and destroyed in his reputation—the picture of a free country would be perfect. What a glorious country this would be.

But I do not want to talk about Hoover any more. This much is true of the pending bill. It proposes to put into the hands of somebody the business of teaching Americanism and to pay for it out of the taxpayers' money, and I am unwilling that any individual shall be picked to teach the people of this country Americanism, because he will teach his kind of Americanism, his ideas of Americanism. It would not do to seek to escape this by saying that it is only \$75,000, and it does not go far. It goes far enough to impress itself upon the public opinion of the country, or else it is not of any value at all; it is wasted. It goes far enough to impress itself upon the forming opinion of these foreigners, or else it does not amount to anything. If it does affect opinion, and help shape that opinion, then it is highly important that Americanism in its proper sense should be taught.

Mr. KENYON. If we can not rely on anyone to teach Americanism, can we rely on any histories of America that may be written? They must be written by some man or woman, and in the last analysis is there not the same argument against both?

Mr. REED. I will state the difference: I would be against an official history of the United States unless it was a mere matter of the statement of absolute facts preserved, as we now preserve them, in our statistical reports, for if the Government of the United States were to be permitted to write a history of itself at the public expense, it could cover every iniquity, every sham, every fraud, and describe all acts as in the public interest.

Let me point out to the Senator the distinction between the two propositions. The Senator asked me if there might not be mistakes made if we had individuals writing history. Yes; there might be something worse than mistakes made if the Government wrote the history. There might be a deliberate attempt to mislead. But if the Government does not attempt to write the history, if it is left to private individuals to write the history, then if private individual "A" writes a false history it has to stand upon its merit. It is subject to the scrutiny of everybody, and private individual "B" is very likely to write a history showing that private individual "A" did not tell the truth, that he was mistaken; and the great public, still possessing a modicum of common sense, judges between the two, and forms its opinion as to which is the proper and true story.

So if we do not attempt to have a governmental teaching of what constitutes Americanism, but leave that to the press, the pulpit, the law school, and all the agencies of enlightenment, the intelligence of the people will form a very correct conclusion. But when the Government goes to teaching what constitutes Americanism you will have the Government teaching



that true Americanism is written in the platform of the dominant party. That is the objection to it.

Mr. KENYON. That leads me to ask the Senator about an utterance or a program of another one of the candidates for President. He has discussed two of them, I think, this afternoon. Mr. Bryan has suggested that the Government ought to issue an official bulletin giving facts to the people; that the press of to-day is in such a condition that it does not give the people the real facts. Now, is there not something to be said in favor of that?

Mr. REED. No; that is wholly unnecessary as long as we have the Commoner and a multitude of other papers.

Mr. KENYON. But suppose they do not have access to the Commoner?

Mr. REED. They can all have access at a dollar a year.

Mr. KENYON. They all have not the dollar.

Mr. REED. In these days a man who can not get a dollar in order to get a newspaper like the Commoner is so poor that he would not be able to get to the polls.

No, Mr. President, and without indulging in any satire toward Mr. Bryan—I am not going to discuss all presidential possibilities—Mr. Bryan has done one or two things in the last few days that have very greatly pleased me. In the first place, he has said to the American people that article 10 of the League of Nations will not do.

In the second place, he has declared that the acceptance of a mandate by this country is a thing that is against the spirit of our institutions. Since I am invited by the chairman of the committee into this field for mowing June grass with a dull scythe, let me call attention to that article of Mr. Bryan. I have not the Commoner with me, but this is a quotation from the Kansas City Star, a very large and influential paper. The quotation is in a telegram from Washington:

Mr. Bryan says in the Commoner that a mandate would be "very objectionable to the American people," and continues:

"In the first place, it is contrary to the theory upon which our Government rests."

The Senator from Iowa appealed for my opinion about Mr. Bryan, and I hope he will pay attention to this.

Mr. KENYON. I am going to listen very attentively.

Mr. REED. The article proceeds, quoting Mr. Bryan:

In the first place it is contrary to the theory upon which our Government rests, and our country will not be willing to step down from its high position and indorse the doctrine upon which land-grabbing empires have tried to justify the exploitation of helpless countries. The pretext is resorted to by one of two classes, namely, those who use it to cover their greed and those who use it to cloak their aristocratic ideas. As our country has neither land hunger nor the aristocratic germ there is no reason why we should enter upon any scheme of government without the consent of the governed. In the second place it would involve us in the politics of the Old World, and the word "politics" over there has a very different meaning from that given to it in this country. In Europe and Asia they have not yet risen to the point of governing for the benefit of the governed. There would be no scramble for mandates if service was the predominant idea. But service is not the predominant idea; it is commercial advantage, and we would at once become involved in the schemes of the commercial nations, each seeking an advantage over the other. We would not do justice to any one of the rivals without offending the others, and we could not favor outsiders without doing injustice to domestic interests.

That is the excerpt that is printed. I have not the original here, but I have no doubt that is perfectly correct.



So I am glad that Mr. Bryan condemns another and a very important part of this document that we are asked to accept. He has at last stated, in a voice which I am sure will be heard over the country, what I have said in my weak way on a number of public occasions. He has said it perhaps better; but what I said was that "mandatory" is only a polite name for military conquest; that it means nothing more nor less than that some people or some nation is to be held in subjection at the point of the sword; that an armed soldiery is to be quartered upon them; and that they are to be compelled, if necessary by fire and sword, to submit themselves to the will of another people.

You may call that a mandatory if you please, but Rome called it conquest; Great Britain called it conquest; France called it conquest; the United States of America called it conquest up to the very moment when it became necessary or desirable, according to the opinions of some gentlemen, to sanctify these conquests, whereupon they sought out the gentle term "mandatory."

Since I am off the track of the argument we are having, and referring again to Mr. Hoover, let me put this into the RECORD, since the question of his citizenship is raised: On the 8th day of May, 1917, he testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He had arrived in this city only two or three days before. I will read these questions a little out of order. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] propounded this question to Mr. Hoover:

When did you get back?

That is, back from Europe. Mr. Hoover had described how he had been over there transacting business with the food controllers of England.

I arrived here on Thursday.

The first question that was asked Mr. Hoover in this examination, which occurred on the 8th day of May, which succeeded the Thursday of his arrival, was this:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hoover, will you please state your full name and address?

A. My name is Herbert C. Hoover; and I am at present at the Willard Hotel, this city, which is my only residence now.

"Which is my only residence now." But since he has started to run for President he claims California has, I understand, been his residence all the time. When he got back here from England he said that the Willard Hotel was his only residence; but at that time he owned a house in London, where his goods, wares, and chattels were located.

In Who's Who in America, written in 1916-17, volume 9, will be found this information.

Mr. GORE. Who's Who in America is not confined to Americans?

Mr. REED. Oh, no. Who's Who in America does not limit itself to Americans. This is what appears in the volume to which I have referred:

Hoover, Herbert Clark, engineer \* \* \* Home; Red House, Horn-ton Street, London. Offices: 1 London Wall Buildings, London, E. C., England; 71 Broadway, New York; Mills Building, San Francisco.

There is a great deal more about that that I want to say later on.

Mr. President, since we have been led into this discussion of Mr. Hoover, I want to have it appear in the RECORD that the New York American to-day prints on its front page a statement giving the names of the men who attended the luncheon at which was launched the candidacy of Mr. Hoover for President of the United States. The statement is accompanied by the pictures of the men who were present at the luncheon.

It will be recalled that the New York World, which is owned by the Pulitzer estate, or by the members of that family, indorsed Mr. Hoover a day or two ago. The editorial indorsed him whether he ran as a Democrat or as a Republican or as a hybrid. The New York American prints the pictures of the principal dinner guests. That of Mr. Ralph Pulitzer, owner of the World, appears at the left. Next to him is Mr. Frank I. Cobb, editor of the New York World. Next to them is Viscount Edward Grey, British Ambassador to the United States, and next to him Herbert C. Hoover, who is labeled "corporation director and friend of President Wilson." Next to him is Col. E. M. House, President Wilson's—this states "political handyman," but I will withdraw those words. Then next is Cleveland H. Dodge, millionaire Wall Street financier, and then Cyrus H. K. Curtis, Philadelphia publisher. The statement of the article is—and I am reading the headlines—

The British envoy sat in at famous gathering. Col. House had five guests at luncheon to fix on candidate to succeed Woodrow Wilson. Aim of the gathering was to choose a man who would carry out President's policies. Newspapers, Wall Street, and the English Government represented, and Hoover boom started.

I ask permission to insert in the RECORD, without reading, the article in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

THE BRITISH ENVOY SAT IN AT FAMOUS GATHERING—COL. HOUSE HAD FIVE GUESTS AT LUNCHEON TO FIX ON CANDIDATE TO SUCCEED WOODROW WILSON—AIM OF THE GATHERING WAS TO CHOOSE A MAN WHO WOULD CARRY OUT PRESIDENT'S POLICIES—NEWSPAPERS, WALL STREET, AND THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT REPRESENTED, AND HOOVER BOOM STARTED.

Herbert C. Hoover, whose candidacy for the presidency was publicly launched recently, was in this city yesterday consulting with his New York backers.

Prominent among these are Cleveland H. Dodge, the Morgans, and certain representatives of the railroads, notably the New York Central.

The Philadelphia North American, Mr. Wanamaker's newspaper, gives a highly interesting account of the launching of the Hoover boom, which occurred at a luncheon given by Col. Edward M. House, at which were representatives of the various interests supporting Mr. Hoover and anxious to secure his election as President.

At this luncheon were: Ralph Pulitzer and Frank I. Cobb, respectively, owner and editor of the New York World; Cleveland H. Dodge, Wall Street financier; Cyrus H. K. Curtis, Philadelphia publisher; and Viscount Edward Grey, British ambassador to the United States.

It is rather unusual to have a British ambassador present at an occasion at which the boom for an American President is launched. But Mr. Hoover is understood to be the candidate of the Democratic administration, pledged to perpetuate Mr. Wilson's policies. And, naturally, the British ambassador is anxious to see policies continued which have been so advantageous to England.

Mr. Pulitzer and Mr. Cobb represent the New York World, which has been the supporter of the administration through thick and thin, and is generally recognized as the official organ of the administration.

Mr. Curtis is publisher of the Saturday Evening Post, the Philadelphia Public Ledger, and other publications.

## DODGE A WALL STREET FINANCIER.

Mr. Dodge is a leading Wall Street financier, connected with many of the big interests. He is known to the public mainly as a heavy contributor to Mayor Mitchel's \$2,000,000 election fund. He was also known as a large contributor to the Wilson campaign fund. Mr. Dodge also came before the public notice by reason of his association with the Phelps-Dodge Mining Co., which in 1917 deported 1,200 workmen from their Bisbee, Ariz., mining properties, which caused great public furor at the time.

Col. House is well known. He has been the right hand of the Wilson administration and probably is still, although a statement was given out for political purposes that he had had a difference with Mr. Wilson.

The Philadelphia North American's article follows; at the time this article was printed the presence of Viscount Grey at Col. House's luncheon had not been made public, but since then the fact of his presence there has been fully verified, and the list now stands as above detailed, including the British ambassador:

"COL. HOUSE DINNER WAS BIRTHPLACE OF HOOVER BOOM—TEXAN'S TACTICS SEEN IN SUDDEN CALL FOR CANDIDATE.

"WASHINGTON, January 22.

"The sudden effulgence of the Hoover star in the firmament of presidential possibilities is not a cosmic accident. It is the result of well and carefully laid plans, under the direction of that practiced Presidential maker, Col. E. M. House.

"The chronology of the Hoover boom begins with the return from Europe of Col. House, sick in body and sore at heart over the heartless treatment he had suffered at the hands of President Wilson. Having had the luxury of private ownership of a presidential administration for more than six years, Col. House refused to be thrown in the discard without ceremony.

"What was done prior to December 3 in the way of getting a new President for the quiet little Texas colonel does not yet appear. The first fact of record is that on December 4 the New York World, whose chief recent claim to fame had been its unfaltering devotion to President Wilson, editorially announced that it would not stand for a third term for him.

"The very next day, December 5, Col. House gave a dinner at his apartments. Among the colonel's guests were Ralph Pulitzer and Frank Cobb, respectively owner and editor of the World; Cleveland H. Dodge, a very rich man, hitherto a friend of the President and Col. House; and Cyrus H. K. Curtis, publisher of the Public Ledger, of Philadelphia.

"On the following Monday, December 8, the World published a story in which its veteran political reporter, Louis Seibold, occupied several columns telling that Col. House and the President were on the outs. A great deal of the several columns was taken up with a recapitulation of the colonel's value as a counselor and his shrewdness as a political manager.

"Soon Hoover talk began to spring up with apparent spontaneity in various quarters. There was mysterious discussion as to his availability as a candidate for either party. Hoover headquarters were opened here and there, frequently under the management of a former member of Mr. Hoover's food administration.

"About the middle of December the Public Ledger devoted nearly two columns of space to exalting Mr. Hoover, without declaring for him for President; but, as the Ledger did not retract or mitigate its praise next day, it was considered very showy for the Ledger.

"About that time came the announcement that a group of capitalists had purchased the Washington Herald.

"Among these were Charles R. Crane and Julius Barnes. Crane is a rich Chicago manufacturer, who had been a big contributor to the Wilson campaign and had since that time been on intimate terms with Col. House. Barnes is the Federal wheat dictator and a close friend of Hoover. The other capitalist in the group was Hoover himself.

"About a week ago Mr. Barnes, at a trade dinner, nominated Hoover for President, attempted to classify him politically as a progressive Republican, but served warning on the Republicans that if they do not accept Hoover as a candidate the Democrats might avail themselves of this alluring chance to have a winning candidate. Incidentally he gave a sort of vicarious assurance that Mr. Hoover would accept the Democratic nomination.

"The matter was put by the reporters to Mr. Hoover, who was ready with an oracular reply. It left him free to do anything that occasion might suggest.



"Within four days, the New York World made its declaration for Hoover. Explaining its position, the World said it would be glad to support him as a candidate on a platform that 'represented the historical principles of the Democratic Party'; it would 'be glad to support him as an independent candidate on a platform of progressive liberalism'; and it would 'not hesitate to support him as the Republican candidate on a platform representing the kind of government which Mr. Hoover exemplified in his public career.'

"The World's declaration set the old Democratic organization by the ears. The Senators who meekly have taken orders from Wilson for seven years in the hope of inheriting his mantle couldn't see Hoover with a telescope, and they used a megaphone in telling it to the world.

"But the widespread Hoover uprising left little doubt that the able and noiseless Col. House had done a good job. The New Republic, a periodical devoted to spreading Col. House's kind of internationalism and operated by Col. House's personal friends, comes out this week for Hoover. The devoted "E. S. M." editorial writer of Life also picks Hoover as the successor of Wilson in its adoration of the White House.

"In the meantime the other Democratic aspirants are living in dread that the little Texas colonel will give another dinner. From present appearances that would make Hoover unanimous in the Democratic convention. Always with the possible exception of Mr. Bryan in the doubtful background."

#### CURTIS'S NEWSPAPER DECLARES HOOVER IS WILSON'S CANDIDATE.

Strangely enough, yesterday morning at the same time the North American printed its story, the Philadelphia Public Ledger, owned by Cyrus H. K. Curtis, one of the guests at Col. House's luncheon and a very close friend of Mr. Wilson, printed in its most prominent position on the first page a story that Herbert Hoover is Woodrow Wilson's candidate for the White House. The story appeared under this head:

#### "HOOVER CHOICE OF WILSON FOR THE PRESIDENCY."

The story, under a Washington date line, began:

"Herbert C. Hoover is Woodrow Wilson's candidate for the Presidency. That assurance was given to the Public Ledger correspondent to-night from a quarter which bears every indication of being well informed."

Beyond question Mr. Hoover is the choice of Mr. Wilson for the Presidency, and he will to a large extent secure the support of all the devoted followers of Mr. Wilson and all the supporters of Mr. Wilson's policies.

Mr. REED. I also ask to put in the RECORD, from the same paper, a cable dispatch of January 29, 1917, sent from London by Charles H. Grasty, staff correspondent. It will be interesting, I think, to Senators.

There being no objection, the cable dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BRITAIN WANTED BELOVED HOOVER TO TURN ENGLISH.

Herbert Hoover, a resident of England for most of the time from 1902 until 1914, was so well thought of in Great Britain that officials in the highest circles there wanted him to become a Briton.

A cable dispatch printed in the New York Times on January 29, 1917, sent from London by Charles H. Grasty, a staff correspondent, stated:

"Mr. Hoover's abilities have excited the greatest admiration in the highest circles. They have wanted him very much to become an English citizen, and I don't think that I exaggerate when I say that the House of Lords would not have been beyond his reach if he had consented to change his allegiance."

Mr. Hoover was a partner in Bewick, Moreing & Co., mine operators, with offices in London, from 1902 until 1908. He was director of the following English firms from 1908 to 1914: Zine Corporation (Ltd.); Kyshtim Corporation (Ltd.); Tanalyk Corporation (Ltd.); Oroya Exploration Co. (Ltd.); Russo-Asiatic Corporation (Ltd.).

